

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 THOMAS EUGENE MOORE,

10 Petitioner,

No. CIV S-02-0007 JAM DAD P

11 vs.

12 ROBERT HOREL, et al.,

13 Respondents.

ORDER

14 _____/
15 On April 28, 2011, petitioner filed a motion for the appointment of counsel and a
16 motion for permission to appeal. (Doc. Nos. 182 & 183.)

17 This action was closed on April 1, 2011. (Doc. Nos. 179 & 180.) On April 28,
18 2011, petitioner filed a notice of appeal. (Doc. No. 181.) Petitioner's appeal to the Ninth Circuit
19 has already been processed by this court. (Doc. No. 186.) Petitioner's recently filed motions will
20 therefore be denied as moot.

21 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

22 1. Petitioner's April 28, 2011 request for appointment of counsel (Doc. No. 182)
23 is denied as moot;

24 2. Petitioner's April 28, 2011 request for permission to appeal (Doc. No. 183) is
25 denied as moot; and

26 /////

3. Petitioner is advised that documents filed by petitioner since the closing date will be disregarded and no orders will issue in response to future filings.

DATED: May 24, 2011.



DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DAD:6
moor0007.dd